Teacher Education Council

November 12, 2010

3:00Pm-5:00pm

Provost’s Conference Room (405 Miller)

**MINUTES**

Members Present: A. Schutt, A. Lachance, C. Widdal, C. Sarver, K. Seibert, D. Dickerson, E. Jampole, E. Kudela, J. Duncan, J. Bailey, J. Shedd, J. Lykos, L. Campbell, M. Kelly, R. Janke, W. Buxton, M. Barduhn, J. Cottone, B. Mattingly, D. Farnsworth, E. Gravani, J. Mosher, K. Beney, M. Canfield, N. Aumann

1. Approve Agenda: Approved by consensus with the following modifications: Remove J. Shirley, Add introduction of name badges from FEAC.
2. Approve Minutes from 10/08/10: Minutes were approved without modification or addition.
3. Standing Committee Reports:
   1. TEC Bylaws Committee-J. Cottone, M. Barduhn, N. Aumann, J. O’Callaghan
      1. Results of the e-vote on adoption of updated language: D. Farnsworth certified that the ballot on proposed updates did not carry as the total vote did not constitute a majority vote. The TEC voting membership in attendance authorized the reopening of the ballot for an additional week in order to garner a majority for the vote.
   2. TEC Assessment Committee: A. Lachance, Chair
      1. Graduate Assessment Challenges for Standard 1: Andrea indicated that the committee has talked about the need to make a unit commitment to some type of data collection system. TaskStream was suggested. She also discussed recommending some unit assessments based on a program by program review of gaps in current assessment matching institutional/unit needs. There have been some challenges answering many of the questions from Standard 1 due to a lack of specific assessments particularly in the graduate/advanced programs. The plan is to develop 2 to 3 new assessments that will address this need by the end of the Spring ’11 Semester.
      2. Status of Discipline specific addenda to the STE: We will be calling for a status report on this soon so that we can automate the process and integrate it with the STE Instrument. Most all programs have or are working on adding an addendum to the Unit STE. This is a voluntary process and the issue has been discussed at length in FEAC. David Dickerson asked how departments can get the completed addendum online. K. Beney indicated that any program with a completed item should contact her and she will make arrangements to have this added to the STE.
      3. Conceptual Framework Committee: J. Mosher discussed branding and marketing requirements for items (pins, posters, table tents, etc.) advertising our updated Conceptual Framework. She and her committee have worked very hard on all of these items and they feel that with the changes that have been made the document and related items should represent us well. She also discussed the changes and re-sequencing of the CF Crosswalk and the need to have these changes reflected in our syllabi. Finally, she indicated that the updated document (representing a synopsis of 12,000 characters will be officially rolled out at meetings of the Adolescence Education Council and at the Joint Chairs Council. In addition the documents and related items will be posted to our teacher education website. The entire conceptual framework will be a main topic at the Spring President’s Opening.
      4. TECRC: N. Aumann reported standard operations on this committee.
         1. Report on Teacher Education Dispositions: Nancy informed the TEC that she is chairing a committee that is in the process of reviewing and making recommendations on Teacher Education Dispositions and that she would provide a full report for the December meeting of the TEC.
      5. TEC Curriculum Committee: E. Gravani –In Eileen’s absence, Nancy Aumann who also sits on the committee presented an informal report. Nancy shared that the only proposal in front of the committee right now is for a change to secondary social studies but to date there has been no action taken. Andrea Lachance suggested that we figure out who should sit on the committee so that we are sure of equal representation or have a TEC Curriculum Rep at the College -Level Curriculum Committee. Currently, there is no representative from the School of Education. She further suggested that perhaps the TEC By-laws committee could take another look at that committee. John Cottone indicated that past proposals to abolish the committee were shot down rather quickly, so he was unsure whether another look at the by-laws would be productive.
4. Old Business : None
5. New Business
   1. Agenda format transition: A recommendation from the TEC Steering Committee -D. Farnsworth explained that the TEC Steering Committee was concerned that too much time in our monthly meetings was spent on discussion of non-action items like our standing committee reports. Therefore, we are proposing that we adopt a ‘consent agenda’ format wherein the Chairs of the standing committees produce brief written statements each month on the activity of the committee to be included in the agenda when it is published. The agenda will then provide for a very brief period where targeted questions related to standing committee activities could be asked and answered. The end result of this change in agenda format should allow for more extensive and productive discussions of critical issues that come before the TEC. **This proposal was adopted by consensus of the voting members of the TEC present and voting.**
   2. Presentation on Portfolio Assessment in TaskStream-C. Widdal did an informative presentation on the TaskStream Portfolio Assessment capacity available through the program. Andrea Lachance also talked briefly about the role that Chris plays for her department and the value of having access to programs such as TaskStream in producing reports, organizing data, and analyzing that data in order to improve program through proactive decision-making.
   3. Discussion: Title II Students with Disabilities Committee-Janet Duncan and team-Janet did a brief presentation for the TEC on the charge that her committee was tasked with in regard to Students With Disabilities and how we, as an institution can affirm that our teacher education candidates, both General education and Special Education are effective in their interactions with this group of students. As a preliminary step in making such a determination the committee has developed a survey that stakeholder groups will be asked to complete in the very near future. Janet reviewed the component parts of the survey with the TEC.
      1. There was also a lively discussion related to concerns over the Emergency Adoption of Proposed Regulations Relating to the Program Registration Requirements for Teacher Education Programs and the Restructuring of Adolescence Level Teacher Certification for Students with Disabilities. It was decided that two members would draft a letter to the NYS Department of Education articulating what our concerns were from a number of different perspectives.
   4. Kathy Beney discussed a recommendation from the FEAC suggesting that all SUNY Cortland teacher candidates wear branded ID Cards with lanyards. Kathy introduced this idea and talked about the positive reaction to the idea voiced by school administrators and others, particularly members of the TEC Advisory Board. She will be on the next agenda to discuss this in greater detail, including costs and the FEAC policy governing such a requirement.
6. Other: Update on the Marilyn Feldman visit-NCATE Unit Assessment: Marley provided some very general comments on the visit by the NCATE consultant that took place over the last two days. Her general feeling was that the consultant was worth the effort expended in bringing Dr. Feldmann to campus. A more thorough report by the consultant will be forthcoming and will be shared with all interested parties.
7. Adjourned at 5:11pm. The next meeting of the TEC will be held on December 10, 2010 in Jacobus Hall from 3:00pm to 5:00pm.